

**SPECIAL MEETING
BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN
(Called by the Board of Aldermen)**

June 12, 2006

**5:30 PM
Aldermanic Chambers
City Hall (3rd Floor)**

Mayor Guinta called the meeting to order.

Mayor Guinta called for the Pledge of Allegiance, this function being led by Alderman Thibault.

A moment of silent prayer was observed.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Roy, Gatsas, Long, Duval, Osborne, Pinard, O’Neil,
Lopez, Shea, DeVries, Garrity, Smith, Thibault and Forest

Resolution:

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to Make Certain Budgetary Closings for the Year 2006.”

On motion of Alderman Pinard, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil it was voted to read the Resolution by title only, and it was so done.

On motion of Alderman Pinard, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil it was voted to refer the Resolution to the Committee on Finance.

On motion of Alderman O’Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault it was voted to recess the special meeting to allow the Committee on Finance to meet.

Mayor Guinta called the meeting back to order.

A report of the Committee on Finance was presented recommending, after due and careful consideration, that Resolutions:

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to Make Certain Budgetary Closings for the Year 2006.”

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$20,000) from Contingency to Fire – Line.”

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000) from Contingency to Fire – Mechanical Division.”

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of Forty Three Thousand Dollars (\$43,000) from Contingency to Police – Uniformed Police.”

ought to pass and be enrolled.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity it was voted to accept, receive and adopt the report of the Committee on Finance.

Appropriating Resolution:

“A Resolution appropriating to the Manchester Airport Authority the sum of \$52,321,042 from Special Airport Revenue Funds for Fiscal Year 2007.”

On motion of Alderman Pinard, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault it was voted to read the Resolution by title only, and it was so done.

On motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted that the Appropriating Resolution pass and be Enrolled.

Appropriating Resolution:

“A Resolution appropriating the sum of \$16,664,386 from Sewer User Rental Charges to the Environmental Protection Division for Fiscal Year 2007.”

On motion of Alderman O’Neil, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries it was voted to read the Resolution by title only, and it was so done.

On motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault it was voted that the Appropriating Resolution pass and be Enrolled.

Appropriating Resolution:

“A Resolution appropriating to the Central Business Service District the sum of \$244,000 from Central Business Service District Funds for Fiscal Year 2007.”

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Roy it was voted to read the Resolution by title only, and it was so done.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Smith it was voted that the Appropriating Resolution pass and be Enrolled.

Resolution:

“Continuation of the Central Business Service District.”

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil it was voted to read the Resolution by title only, and it was so done.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil it was voted that the Resolution pass and be Enrolled.

Appropriating Resolution:

“Appropriating all Incremental Meals and Rooms Tax Revenue Received by the City in Fiscal Year 2007 and held in the Civic Center Fund, for the payment of the City’s Obligations in Said Fiscal Year Under the Financing Agreement.”

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil it was voted to read the Resolution by title only, and it was so done.

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity it was voted that the Appropriating Resolution pass and be Enrolled.

Appropriating Resolution:

“Amending a Resolution ‘A Resolution appropriating to the Manchester Transit Authority the sum of \$1,100,000 for the Fiscal Year 2007’ to \$850,000.”

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Roy it was voted that the Resolution be read by title only, and it was so done.

Alderman Lopez stated at this time I don’t know if it would be appropriate to make the amendment or present some of the other items and then come back to the Resolutions, whichever you prefer.

Mayor Guinta stated I think it would be appropriate to see the entire package.

Alderman Lopez asked can I have someone from the City Clerk’s Office pass out the budget please. While they are doing that I will take this opportunity to make a statement. There is no one on this Board who does not want to cut property taxes but as stated in the City Charter, this Charter it says “This charter expresses the desire we, the citizens, have to govern ourselves in the most effective, efficient and beneficial manner. We resolve for ourselves and our children that there be a representative government which promotes the general welfare and stimulates harmony and creativity among its citizens. Through the elective process, we secure for ourselves and future generations a municipal government which strives to achieve compassion, freedom and justice.” Now your Honor I would like to address the budget. As an Alderman At-Large and Chairman of the Board, I, like you, represent the entire City. Therefore it is incumbent upon me to respond to the budgetary needs of the City departments and School District. During the last campaign you made a number of promises – better schools, better results, a safer place to live and work, continued economic development and lower taxes. As commendable as all of the above are, how can you provide the people of Manchester better schools, a safer place to live and work and

economic development with an underfunded budget? Your proposed budget for the School District will begin the erosion of the progress that has been achieved and jeopardize legal agreements with unions and surrounding communities. The School District needs to be sufficiently funded to continue its progress in improving our children's education. On the City side, department heads developed their budgetary needs based on the requirements to sustain efficient and economic operations. The budget consideration ignores critical shortfalls. Very fortunately our forefathers had the vision to entrust the City spending plan not only to the Mayor but also to the Aldermen. There is a compelling need for an adequate budget. I and other members of the Board have developed a budget proposal that is frugal and which we believe will keep Manchester moving forward. Our proposed budget was developed to provide the School District with funds to avoid laying off teachers, reducing or eliminating key programs and to meet its obligations to tuition students from surrounding towns. Sabrina Thomas, a Manchester educator and mother of a six year old son stated the situation clearly and concisely in a recent opinion letter appearing in *the Union Leader* when she wrote that your budget will result in a "stack em deep, teach em cheap" approach to education. We must provide an adequate budget. We provided additional funding to public safety departments to protect the health and welfare of the City residents. I am providing sufficient funds for the infrastructure to keep strong and to keep our commitment to our City workers. We believe that it is the responsibility of elected officials to do what is right to keep Manchester moving forward by providing the City departments and the School District sufficient funds to do their job. Our budget achieves these objectives while being prudent. Our City department heads are professionals in their fields. Let them run their departments, Mr. Mayor. Neither you nor the Aldermen should attempt to micromanage our City departments. Let the professionals do their jobs. This is what is called accountability and responsibility. The success or failure of a department falls directly in the laps of department heads. To paraphrase President Truman, the buck stops with them. It is the Board of Mayor and Aldermen's job to set policy. Mr. Mayor, you and the Aldermen have the power to eliminate and not fill vacant positions, which saves taxpayer dollars. The City of Manchester is at a critical crossroads. The City can continue to flourish and attract new residents and businesses and provide an excellent education for our children and provide its residents with a safe and enjoyable environment. The alternative is standing still or worse yet taking giant steps backwards. We must provide our City departments and the School District with the funds they need to continue to move ahead. It is our duty as elected officials to do what is best for Manchester. With that, your Honor, I will go over some of the information on the sheet that I passed out for the budget. As you can see looking down the sheet, incidentally I want to tell members of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen that I spent some time with other Aldermen today, with Kevin Clougherty, Randy Sherman and others and went over these numbers and they were verified to the degree that they were correct. I am adding \$66,228 to the City Clerk. The new number is \$1,158,838. I deducted \$30,000 from the Economic Development line item for marketing. It comes to \$380,823. I deducted \$181,537 from the Finance Department. The new number is \$1,304,313. Also I deducted \$60,000 from revenue. For Information Systems I added \$186,029. The new number is \$2,030,336. By

now the people out there don't have it but there are different colors on the sheet. The black numbers are the Mayors and Alderman Gatsas' number is in red and ours is in blue. Youth Services I added \$18,852. The new number is \$596,927. For Building Maintenance I added \$19,300. The new number is \$6,921,325. The Tax Collector I added \$79,524. The new number is \$766,812. In the Fire Department I added \$381,275. The new number is \$22,840,146. For Police I added \$111,853. The new number is \$22,795,498. For Welfare I added \$24,672. The new number is \$1,310,819. For the Library I added \$110,654. The new number is \$2,780,715. In the School District I added \$2.5 million. The new number is \$145,500,000. The salary adjustment account is at \$400,000. In contingency we added \$100,000. The new number is \$300,000. We added \$390,000 in revenue and I will explain that in a minute. We added another \$20,000 in revenue to Welfare. We added revenue that goes into the Finance Office, which is \$320,000. That revenue number now becomes \$12,207,654. The reason for that is we have an opportunity...it should have been done a long time ago. Every vehicle that is registered in this City is a \$2 charge and we are authorized by State law to go to \$5. We are authorized to go more than that but we don't want to do that. We will go to \$5 for every car that is registered in the City. Let me go back to where we got the \$100,000 to put into contingency. I was informed today and I can let the Finance people talk to this but the County tax is now as you see on your budget sheet \$10,248,959. It was \$10,581,414. That is about \$350,000. We deducted, in order to make this budget, \$1,350,000 from the salary adjustment account. We added \$5 million to the valuation. The City Assessors have indicated a range between \$60 million to \$90 million and they testified before us that that was the number. I took the high number of going to \$90 million instead of \$85 million. By going up \$5 million in valuation that gives us another \$140,000. The tax rate increase is 0.95%. That equalizes out to \$.27 per \$1,000. One of the notations in the budget that we talked about in the Finance Committee and we wanted to make sure that the Highway Department was definitely taken care of was that Highway is not subject to any hiring freeze but will live within their budget. All other departments are subject to the hiring freeze only for the simple reason that in the Highway Department they took a 3% cut and they are willing to work within that 3% and that was acceptable. In order to access the salary adjustment account, the department head shall write a letter to the Mayor. The letter shall contain the reasons for requesting the funds, the amount of funds and consequences if the funds are denied. The Mayor shall either approve the request or deny the request. If the request is denied and there is an appeal by the department head it will go to the full Board of Mayor and Aldermen for approval or disapproval. I also want to mention this is a bottom line budget for the department heads. I don't expect, if this budget is approved, that anyone will be coming in for salary adjustment. You work our budget and work your numbers as we always have in the past. An exception will be made for the Fire Department and Police Department at the Mayor's discretion for the safety aspect of it but in no case should they ask for any money until January of February. They got the money there to play with...not play with but to work with until such time that the Finance people can get their hands on it and we all know, we all know that department heads if they are short, especially the Fire Department or anybody else, they usually send us a letter and we refer it

to Finance and as we just took action tonight we gave the Finance Officer the authority to balance the budget on June 30 by taking all of the necessary money away from the departments that is not going to be used. With that, I want to note that some of my colleagues wanted to say something your Honor. I am here to answer questions if anybody has any.

Alderman Thibault stated as you have heard before and I talked about it here before but I felt that the Library was being cut by a much larger amount than what they should and I am glad to see that Alderman Lopez has come up with a new number for them. I feel that they are going to be able to live with this number. I have never had as many calls and as many letters as I have had, and I have been here 18 years, and I have never had as many calls and letters about the Library being cut the way it would have been. I support that 100%.

Alderman O'Neil stated first of all I want to commend you because you challenged us. I think as an entire body I can't remember a Board working more hours and there being more interaction with each other at those meetings than happened this year. I don't think that was a bad thing. I hope we don't work those same hours in two years but some of those challenges we put into place. You challenged us regarding the Traffic Division and Parking Enterprise. The Administration Committee met tonight. We adopted some transition plans. Hopefully the full Board will allow us to bring that in so it will be ready to happen July 1. If not, we have to wait until July 11 but that was a challenge and we have actually moved forward on that. You challenged us on purchase cards. Although I am not particularly in favor of jumping into them 100%, I would like to see us pilot it in some departments. I have talked to some communities that have used these or looked at them. There are pros and cons but I think it is worth looking at. You challenged us on Central Purchasing. Although I don't believe we need to move staff to a dedicated Central Purchasing Office, I do believe we need to come up with tighter policies and procedures to improve Central Purchasing. Same with Fleet Management. I don't necessarily agree that we need a Fleet Manager. What we need are more stringent policies and procedures and I will use the example if we are buying six sedans, if six departments are buying six sedans they all do it at different times and they write different specifications. We should say we are going out for sedans once a year and if you are not ready to do it you don't get it that year. Same thing with tires, etc. I think we can do that by just adopting policies and procedures. A couple of communities told me they no longer use the state bid. They found that dealing with local dealers you can actually get a better price on fleet. We have been stuck on buying off the state bid. For the first time in my tenure here we had some very good discussions about Information Systems and I commend you for that. I think we are going to continue to develop a great working relationship with the Information Systems Department. We added police officers, which was one of your goals. We figured out as a group how to get it there and we have done that. We have done a lot of work. I think everybody needs to be commended. I think you challenged us and I applaud you for challenging us on that so thank you, your Honor.

Alderman Osborne stated I would like to ask Alderman Lopez a question. The \$2 tack on for car registrations, what was the final figure on that?

Alderman Lopez responded the \$3 is \$330,000.

Alderman Osborne stated what I would like to see and I know this year what you are going to be using for but next year I would like to see this type of thing here like the rest of it earmarked to the Highway Department for resurfacing. I think this would help resurfacing a lot in the City and I would like to see that happen.

Alderman Lopez responded I have taken that into consideration. I just have to get an interpretation from the City Solicitor on the state law because by use of this money there is wording in there that is saying where there are parking meters we can use that money so we can take a good look at that and I haven't had an opportunity to address that legally. For example, if we had parking meters on the street my interpretation is that they could actually fix the street areas where there are parking meters or a parking garage but I have to get a legal interpretation.

Alderman Osborne replied well whatever we can do I would like to see that money earmarked for the Highway Department. One other thing as far as the money that is going to the schools - \$145.5 million, I would hope that it is going for the pink slips. I know we have no jurisdiction on where the monies go after they leave here but I would hope at least that it would go to the pink slips.

Mayor Guinta stated I need a clarification. The increase on the fee to register a vehicle goes from \$2 to \$5.

Alderman Lopez responded yes.

Mayor Guinta asked and that brings in how much revenue.

Alderman Lopez answered \$330,000.

Alderman Gatsas stated you didn't do the math but that is a 150% increase. I have some direct questions for Alderman Lopez because at least...we are not going to have the opportunity to look at this for some two weeks as we did with the last presentation that came before us but we can look at it maybe until at least tomorrow. I guess my first question is you must have spoken to somebody to add \$2.5 million to the School District and can you tell me what your justification is and who you spoke to please?

Alderman Lopez replied I can tell you this. A lot of Aldermen had a lot of input into this particular number. I can tell you that I have personally been down to the School Department as other Aldermen have been. I can tell you that there were different solutions to coming to this particular number. I will give you my solution as others have given me their solution and that is a combination of \$145.5 million. What I did is working from the \$143 million the teachers that have been given pink slips, which were general fund positions, there were 38 teachers and that was \$1.4 million. There was \$263,000 eliminating the Ombudsman program. There was \$166,000 eliminating the Community Partnership TAP and STAY programs. There was \$120,000 for CPI training and professional development. Athletics reduction was \$375,000 and then there was the debt service that we just approved tonight at \$180,000. That came out to a total of \$145,635,000. I know that they are going to have to make some very strong decisions over there to reach the \$145 million. That is how I came up with it. If other Aldermen want to tell you how they came up with it, that is fine.

Alderman Gatsas asked this is your budget isn't it.

Alderman Lopez answered this is the Aldermen's budget – a combination of Aldermen.

Alderman Gatsas stated I think I remember at the last meeting we had unanimous votes on an awful lot of these resolutions and I just wanted to see what a week's time incurred in additional spending. There has to be different mindsets when you get to that.

Alderman Lopez responded I think what we did under state law, under the laws of the Charter all we did at the last meeting was to submit the budget to layover to give us an opportunity. I think you are well aware that we had some problems. If you are not I will tell you that we had some problems in a couple of departments where I wasn't comfortable bringing anything in as well as the other Aldermen. We wanted to make sure. That is the answer to your question.

Alderman Gatsas replied so at some point what you are saying is that there should be...all of the things we heard from the public back some month ago you have instituted all of these things so none of the things you are talking about should be cut. You added the \$2.5 million in for that?

Alderman Lopez responded it is my opinion that I am giving them the money so that some of the more important things such as not laying off any teachers...yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked so if anybody is pink slipped or if somebody is laid off that is obviously not something that you planned.

Alderman Lopez answered I would be very hurt if somebody did but I don't have that authority.

Alderman Gatsas stated the next question I have is that when I take a look at an additional...in your budget or the Aldermen's budget or at least the Aldermen that are going to vote for it, there is an additional \$786,850 that you have added in expenditures. Within that line I take a look at Fire and what their department expenditure was. I take a look at Police and see what their department expenditure was and you adjusted your numbers by taking some \$1.350 million out of the salary adjustment account. Once you do that, you don't have enough to allow the Mayor to do what the department needs him to do. Once you have deducted that and you have taken it out, it is very difficult to tell the Mayor protect our City and make sure there are enough police officers on and make sure there are enough firefighters on with \$400,000 and make sure you take a look at the other line items that if somebody does need somebody they can do it. So when you look at those line items, Aldermen, you have to tell me how you think you are going to protect, or the Mayor is going to have the ability to protect the safety and welfare of the people of this City.

Alderman Lopez responded and your question is.

Alderman Gatsas replied that is my question.

Alderman Lopez stated I think that the Aldermen and the Mayor will protect the citizens of this City no matter what budget we come out of these chambers with. It makes no difference. If a situation arises where the Chief of Police is in whatever activity that requires detectives or anything out there I think we are going to come to his aid no matter where we get the money no matter what budget comes forward. I have spoken to Deputy Chief Simmons and Chief Jaskolka and the BSO over there. They have to make some tough decisions. I added money to their particular budget this time because I am told that by the 10th of July they will be at full complement. Now I take that as truth and as the turnover in the Police Department...as you are well aware and as I now the turnover rate is there for the whole year so I believe that the money will be there.

Alderman Gatsas asked so why don't we cut \$2 million out of their line items and tell the people of this City that we are going to protect them and whatever it takes we will put it back in. That is basically what you are saying.

Alderman Lopez answered Alderman I have made my amendments to the budget.

Alderman Gatsas responded I understand but do we have an opportunity to ask the questions or do you want to not answer. Do you want to yield or not? If you won't, I will just stop.

Alderman Lopez asked what is your question.

Alderman Gatsas answered I just said to you why don't we take \$2 million out and promise the people of this City that we will protect them but we don't have the money in the budget to do it but whatever needs to be done we will do that.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have spent especially in the last week a considerable amount of time in communication with the Fire Department – meeting with them, talking to them on the phone, e-mails and to some degree, not quite as many hours but time with the Police Department. I am of the opinion that the budgets that are presented here will allow the Police and Fire Departments to properly do their job and protect the City of Manchester. I believe in this number. There should be no closing of ladder trucks at this time. I believe there is enough money to keep ladder trucks open for the year. Certainly the department is going to have to take some advantage if there are some retirements during the year. They are at full complement going into the high vacation period for the first time in a long time and I think in my discussions...this budget doesn't fully fund the Fire Department. Let's be perfectly clear about that. They still may be short about \$200,000 in regular salaries and about \$300,000 in overtime.

Mayor Guinta stated I apologize for the interruption but I have to stop you there because we need to have a discussion about the salary adjustment line because under this proposal it is only funded at \$400,000.

Alderman O'Neil asked can I give you my opinion on it.

Mayor Guinta answered you can I just want to reiterate that with a \$400,000 number I can't properly administer the adjustments in the Fire Department let alone the entire City so that is something that I think we need to have a discussion about and maybe someone can, for my edification purposes, explain to me how...

Alderman O'Neil interjected I can give you my opinion and maybe Alderman Lopez. This salary adjustment...I think Alderman Lopez noted it in his very last paragraph of his handout. In my opinion, if we approve regarding Highway not subject to freeze but will live within the budget and they actually took more of a cut than anybody else did but they are willing to live in their budget, Highway is out of the way and I am of the opinion to be honest with you the majority of this budget regarding salary adjustment is going to be for needs at the Fire and Police Department. If other vacancies come up, I don't expect they are going to be filled to be honest with you.

Mayor Guinta asked so you are saying you don't expect vacancies to be filled in the Fire Department.

Alderman O'Neil answered no in other City departments.

Mayor Guinta responded okay but even if we don't fill one vacancy in the entire City you are still not allowing enough in the salary adjustment to take care of the Fire Department.

Alderman O'Neil stated I believe based on the number that we put here if...I spent hours over at the Fire Department.

Mayor Guinta stated Alderman Lopez just said \$500,000 and there is only \$400,000 in salary adjustment and that is just one department.

Alderman Lopez stated no.

Alderman O'Neil stated they are \$500,000 off combined regular salaries and overtime. I am of the opinion that they are at full complement going into their high vacation time and we should see some adjustment in overtime to cover vacations. I have also, and I think we had a very good discussion the last time we met with the Chief about he needs to take a look at some of the non direct service items like training. There was \$90,000 in overtime dollars paid to training. It is unacceptable to me that we pay that amount and put ladder trucks out of service. That is unacceptable to me and those are some of the places where the Chief is going to have to take a look at making decisions on.

Mayor Guinta replied I would share your concern about the training versus ladder trucks. The challenge I think we are having right now and I will yield back to Alderman Lopez, the challenge I think we are having now is with having an alternative presented with about 30 hours left. It is going to take a little time...I mean I can't bring up each department head to ask what the expected changes would be to their operation given the fact that I assume they just got this when the Aldermen did. We are going to have to...I will go to Alderman Lopez to clarify it for me because I have some concerns with this issue.

Alderman Lopez stated yes I did mention \$581,000 that the Fire Department was short in reference to the budget that was presented by Alderman Gatsas. I added \$381,275. That only leaves them \$200,000 out of salary adjustment if he has to go there. We don't know what is going to happen. The aspect of overtime is not in the salary adjustment and has never been in the salary adjustment so they are going to have to work out some good details there plus I have had some input from some Aldermen and others in reference to the training division. Yes, it is a tight budget. That is why today I put another \$100,000 in contingency so you really have \$700,000 if you want something for the Fire Department. The other departments in this City...there should be nothing given to these people. They should work within their budgets and as vacancies come along that is your choice as the Mayor as to whether you are going to fill them or not and use the money at the end of the year.

Mayor Guinta stated I will give you an example though of what I think the first challenge that we would be faced with. You are saying Fire is short \$200,000 so if out of the \$400,000

in salary adjustment because contingency I don't know that it is there to lump in with salary adjustment because we have contingency requests so I would like to try to keep them separate. Salary adjustment is at \$400,000 and if \$200,000 goes to Fire that leaves \$200,000 left in the City. You have eliminated the Highway Department from the hiring freeze, which I am a little concerned...I don't know how you can have a hiring freeze for some departments but not for others but essentially if they are short for some reason in two positions that are \$100,000 each and they have to come back to salary adjustment...you said earlier we would take care of the needs of the City so you have expended \$400,000 with two people and Fire. The problem with salary adjustment is the way it works you are looking at the overall salary line item for the City - \$60 million and taking \$2.4 million out and putting \$1 million in and managing the margins and managing the attrition. What this does is put dollars back into each department and fails to account for attrition in some of those departments so we don't have the benefit of attrition in those departments in the salary adjustment line so within probably two months of this budget being enacted we could potentially face some significant problems depending on what happens in attrition in the first 60 days of the fiscal year. That is why I needed at least \$1 million if not more in the salary adjustment line.

Alderman Lopez stated I think it is just a different philosophy I guess. I believe that the department heads get paid very good in this City and they ought to be responsible for their department and whatever the bottom line is they should do it. If they can't do it then I would expect you to come in and get rid of them.

Alderman Gatsas stated I think the very simplest facts are one and I think if the Chief comes up and I am not going to call him up because I don't think we need to get into that discussion but in Police the number that we allocated on the blue sheet was \$22,683,645. That didn't take into consideration the six new hires that had to be brought on. It didn't include that. As soon as you take those six hires and put them in with their benefits, you are going to exceed your \$400,000 that you have for salary adjustment. So we can sit there and say you can play the game as being the CEO but we are not going to give you enough money to do what you need to do. That money is not there.

Alderman Lopez responded let me just remind you in conversation with the Chief and Deputy Chief Simmons because there was going to be a public statement and I wanted to make sure that the Mayor said he put the money in his budget for six new police officers. Deputy Simmons assured me that he did. I don't know where you are getting your information from. The Mayor has indicated to me that he has put the money in the Police Department's budget for six new police officers.

Alderman Gatsas asked in the budget or in the salary adjustment account.

Alderman Lopez answered in his budget. That is what he has been saying all along. He had to step out for a minute but he will be back.

Alderman Gatsas asked so how many vacancies are there right now in Police. Chief, how many vacancies do you have today?

John Jaskolka, Chief of Police, answered with the 13 that we are looking to hire on July 10, including the 6 new officers, I would have 7 vacancies.

Alderman Gatsas asked so for you to fill the seven vacancies there is not enough money in the salary adjustment account even if the Chief put the six in there, if the Mayor had them in his line item. So there is still a shortfall in the salary adjustment to protect the citizens of this City. It is not there. The money is not there. \$400,000 doesn't cover seven hires with benefits. It is very clear. With \$1.750 million, the allocation was there for the Mayor to run the City as you would a business but to tell the Police Chief that you have to wait a few months before you hire those people so we can make it through our budget I don't think is a fair thing to say to him.

Alderman Lopez replied I sat down with the Chief and he can assure you that I did and with Deputy Chief Simmons and the BSO. I can tell you that the numbers are not my numbers but the Chief's numbers. The Mayor is back now and maybe can answer your question because he said and Deputy Chief Simmons has indicated to me that in the Mayor's budget he put the six new police officers in. Am I getting wrong numbers? I don't think so from the Chief and Deputy Chief Simmons. I took into consideration those six new police officers, which the Mayor put in his budget and they told me \$237,000 for six new police officers.

Alderman Gatsas stated well maybe the question needs to be answered how many total police officers does the Mayor have in his budget and if he doesn't have 215 or...what is the full complement.

Chief Jaskolka responded with the six it will be 215.

Alderman Gatsas replied so if the full complement doesn't read at 215 in the Mayor's budget, and I don't know how it can because the Chief's budget is \$1.3 million over that. So if that number doesn't allocate to 215 police officers and maybe your Honor you have to answer it because that is where the discrepancy is. If your budget doesn't have the full complement at 215 then we are short seven officers somewhere.

Mayor Guinta stated I just pulled out my budget book. The request for regular salary for Police was \$15.5 million. I appropriated \$15.1 million. The purpose of having the salary adjustment and what I said during the budget process is my priorities and I will make no

bones about it on the City side is going to be public safety because I think we have some critical public safety issues to address. During the budget process I asked the Chief and reiterated to the Chief that regardless of what appropriation is made he should hire the six officers. Again, part and parcel of that is to have the salary adjustment line for the entire City so we can manage the attrition rate in the entire City. So in my opinion yes the dollars there but it requires essentially new oversight and management of the Mayor's Office, which I don't think we have had in the past. We haven't had this kind of...recently at least this kind of management tool enacted.

Alderman Gatsas asked so what you are saying is that the department asked for \$15.5 million and you allocated \$15.1 million and put \$400,000 in salary adjustment and said you would manage it.

Mayor Guinta answered yes.

Alderman Gatsas stated so your answer is yes...I mean Alderman Roy is telling me no but your answer is yes.

Mayor Guinta stated well my answer is yes and I crafted the budget.

Alderman Gatsas stated so with that you knew you were going to get to the number you wanted because those dollars were in the salary adjustment account.

Chief Jaskolka stated if the money is in the salary adjustment account we can live with those numbers. Again the letter that I sent down strictly deals with overtime and vehicle repair. Those are the two areas that we were quite short in.

Alderman Gatsas replied right but if we are going back to what the Mayor just said there is a \$400,000 salary adjustment account that he had just for Police for them to get to their full complement of 215. I look at that number and say what do we do with the rest of the safety of the City.

Mayor Guinta asked who is the question to.

Alderman Gatsas answered somebody. I guess Chief can you get to a full complement pulling everything out at the number you see before you?

Mayor Guinta stated let me actually...

Alderman Gatsas interjected never mind that is a bad question for you to answer

Alderman O'Neil stated no let him answer it.

Mayor Guinta stated I do want to here the answer to the question...

Alderman Gatsas interjected his answer was different from last week because I asked him last week.

Mayor Guinta asked how much...the addition is \$111,000 to bring Police to \$22.840 million. The overall request was \$23.7 million. The additional \$111,000 did you add it into a certain line item?

Chief Jaskolka answered if that were to be added that would go into overtime and vehicle repair.

Mayor Guinta asked so you would still be short on the regular salary line.

Chief Jaskolka answered yes.

Mayor Guinta stated I want to ask the Alderman are you appropriating those dollars in specific line items.

Alderman Lopez responded I am appropriating to the Police after talking to them it was \$71,853 in the overtime, which is mandatory overtime when they go to court and that is why we put that in the budget and \$40,000 for vehicle maintenance that will go to his line item and he agreed to that. Let me just follow-up by saying that the total needed from the \$22.683 million and this was recorded on June 9 when I talked to the Chief and Deputy Chief Simmons and the BSO...I added \$495,861 to the Mayor's number and that came to \$23,179,506. We have to remember that in the original budget the PCO's were in there and they are no longer there. They are in the Parking Enterprise. By adding the \$111,000 to the \$22 million it became \$22,795,498. Police is short \$384,000 in their budget. This will be made up through salary adjustment and vacancies, which will average and I took the low number of four or five. I think it is going to be higher. It always is. I took the number of four or five that is going to be throughout the year so between now and then and that is why looking at the fiscal budget I think they can operate it. I am very conscious of it but it is just like doing a parade down Elm Street and saying well what if you have a parade and a vehicle is going to go out of control and run over somebody. I am comfortable with this number and I thought that when I had a meeting with them they were very comfortable when I left the office.

Mayor Guinta asked is there an expectation that the Police Department would then not need salary adjustment funds with the addition of this appropriation in this proposal.

Chief Jaskolka answered no your Honor. Salary adjustment from our understanding is strictly salary and doesn't cover overtime. In order to deal with the overtime number that we have we need the additional \$71,853.

Mayor Guinta asked but you don't need regular salary.

Chief Jaskolka answered yes. The salary we have budgeted for the year we estimate somewhere in the vicinity of \$250,000 would be needed from salary adjustment.

Mayor Guinta stated well if it is \$250,000 for Police and \$200,000 for Fire that is \$450,000 and that is over the salary adjustment number.

Alderman O'Neil stated my understanding at the Police Department is right now they have 13 candidates that can get them to a full complement including the 6 new officers. Correct Chief?

Chief Jaskolka responded correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated even doing that since we have had those discussions over the last few months they have other retirements that are going to happen next year correct.

Chief Jaskolka replied two that we know of in July yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated so in my opinion no matter if they put forth their best efforts they are never going to need \$250,000 because they have expended the last of this current list to fill the 13. They are going to have to go through a whole new testing process. We are six months away from any new police officers going on the street. That is the real world. I wish it was a better system where we could get people on the job but it is what it is. Am I correct on that?

Chief Jaskolka replied you are correct Alderman. We do the estimate...all of our estimates are anticipating full complement and that doesn't happen.

Alderman O'Neil stated we all should be commended for getting up to that 215 number but the real world of the Police Department is people leave. We are going to get to the 215 and a very short time after that the complement is going to drop just through retirements. I don't believe...my point being with that whole thing your Honor is I don't think from salary adjustment that they are going to need \$250,000.

Mayor Guinta asked then why change from what I originally proposed of keeping \$1 million in salary adjustment and let's manage the \$60 million number. What is the point of putting some of it back in the departments?

Alderman O'Neil answered because in their particular case there are two items of significance to them that they can't go to salary adjustment for. One is mandatory overtime and the second is vehicle repairs. Is that correct, Chief?

Chief Jaskolka stated that is correct.

Mayor Guinta stated but you can address those without addressing salary adjustment is my point.

Alderman O'Neil asked if you can't take it out of salary adjustment where are you going to get it from once the budget was adopted. Contingency? That is why a couple of meetings ago I asked specifically were the rules going to be set on salary adjustment and I think everybody agreed it was only for salaries. It couldn't go for benefits or overtime. I personally believe that this number will properly protect the citizens of this City.

Alderman Roy stated within a month I find myself hearing an argument that I made in a very spirited debate with yourself and Alderman Gatsas. The salary adjustment account is a philosophy of who gets to manage and run the City. When you put together your budget through your budget address you let everyone know that you took...the comment was \$2.4 million out of salaries, returned \$1 million to the taxpayer and put \$1 million into the salary adjustment account. The same philosophy, which I firmly and strongly disagree with and we had that spirited debate and I lost that debate.

Mayor Guinta asked which philosophy do you disagree with.

Alderman Roy answered the philosophy of...the attempt of management that you looked for to managing in the oversight of the departments through the Mayor's Office versus the department heads.

Mayor Guinta stated well unfortunately I have a...

Alderman Roy interjected can I have the floor.

Mayor Guinta replied excuse me but you were saying something that is a statement about the Office of Mayor and the Office of Mayor, whoever it is, has an obligation to the Charter to do exactly what you believe the Mayor's Office shouldn't do and I think in fairness people in the room and at home should understand the distinction between what we are talking about.

Alderman Roy stated well you recognized me to give a brief statement and ask questions and I am giving that and I will yield right back to you when I am done to finish but that philosophy of how you did your budget, of returning part of that salary money to the

taxpayer, never put all of that salary number into your salary adjustment. We were going to be short and that is what you within 15 minutes have said you were going to manage and run the oversight of. I personally believe we have some very good professionals. One in front of us and many sitting in the audience that have paid their dues as department heads that should be managing their budgets. So this budget puts more money in the hands of the department heads and less money in the hands of the Mayor's Office but provides adequate safety, adequate services that the department heads have said they can work with. If we are going to have a salary adjustment account, we either have to have it as you are asking for – a large number with all management and oversight coming out of your office or a smaller number for your office and a larger number in the departments to let them manage and work within their budgets with your office instead of entirely with your office running it. So when we look at the \$400,000 in salary adjustment, the math is the same but more money got put into the departments. When you did your budget there was \$2.4 million that came out of the salary line item. \$1 million got put into salary adjustment. Now that we are talking about \$400,000 in the salary adjustment, it is similar that there could be \$800,000 or \$900,000 of need but there is only \$400,000 to access.

Mayor Guinta asked well if there is \$800,000 to \$900,000 of need and only \$400,000 to access how do you look the Police Chief in the eye and say that there is enough money to manage because I don't think that is what he is saying.

Alderman Roy answered the same way, Mayor, that there was \$2.4 million worth of need and you said we could manage with \$1 million.

Mayor Guinta replied yes but you have taken out almost all of the departments now and you have removed Highway from this process. Again, you can't have a philosophy for half a City in terms of how you manage the departments and a different philosophy for the other half. First of all it is not fair but second of all it doesn't get to the overall goal of what we are trying to achieve in terms of the overall salary of the City.

Alderman Osborne asked Chief when was the last time you had a full complement.

Chief Jaskolka stated I haven't really had a full complement for any length of time.

Alderman Osborne replied I am talking over the years now.

Chief Jaskolka responded it varies. We get the full complement...

Alderman Osborne interjected have you ever had a full complement.

Chief Jaskolka stated yes.

Alderman Osborne stated well it is not too often. I remember 20 or 25 years ago there were always three or four openings. It seems like you can't fill 100%. You always have some openings to give you leeway is what I am trying to get at.

Chief Jaskolka responded there are always some openings yes. We hit full complement and then within a month we are down.

Alderman Osborne stated so we have to take that into consideration also. I think it will all work out just fine. It is just who is going to manage it.

Alderman Gatsas stated I am just going by and I can't speak for your budget, I can only speak for the budget I proposed and what was allocated back into the budget that I put in salary adjustment was \$750,000 from the original start. That \$750,000 went back in at \$786,000 into the expenditures with zero going back to Police. Zero. One of the biggest departments received zero out of the \$750,000 that went back into the City. Now I think it is a little disheartening for us to sit here and tell the people of Manchester that we are going to add six new police officers and get to a complement of 215 but guess what? We never really ever get there so when you read about the gangs in the City...we aren't going to get to 215 police officers to protect you until some time in six months or maybe longer. It's not your fault chief. We just can't find them. Maybe we need to change that complement from 215 to 220 today because we know you can't fill 215. Maybe that is the wisest thing to do and allow the Chief to come back when he says we have people we can hire to protect to allow the Mayor to make that judgement as to whether to bring them in or not. But for us to sit here some four months ago and say we are doing the right thing in this City to hire six new police officers because we don't have enough protection but today we are not filling the six but we are actually going to have one less for six months. That to me is not a logical thing to tell people in Manchester. I say let's move it to 220 and tell you to fill them as you need them once you have the people waiting there and let the Mayor do it. We are fooling the people of this City if we are telling them we are hiring six new police officers but it is six months before you are going to get to a full complement. At the end of six months we don't know if you are going to get to your full complement. I say let's move it to 220.

Alderman O'Neil asked Chief you will be with the six officers very shortly at full complement.

Chief Jaskolka answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated but you do have indications, whether it is July, August or September that there are some expected retirements.

Chief Jaskolka replied I am sure of one in mid-July and I believe there is another one by the end of July.

Alderman O'Neil stated so he has made all efforts to get to full complement. It is just the nature of the Police Department is that people retire and he does his best to plan on it. The training and recruitment process unfortunately is a very lengthy period of time.

Alderman Gatsas asked Chief did I understand that you have 13 vacancies today.

Chief Jaskolka answered that's correct.

Alderman Gatsas asked including the six new hires.

Chief Jaskolka answered the number 13 includes the 6 new hires. The vacancies are actually seven.

Alderman Gatsas asked so you can get to full complement if you hire the 13 people that are on board.

Chief Jaskolka answered yes.

Alderman Gatsas stated then I misunderstood you. So it is not going to take you six months to get to a full complement.

Chief Jaskolka replied I will get to full complement but this group of officers won't be on the street for six months.

Alderman DeVries stated I think what we have accomplished in this budget does not leave public safety to chance. With both the Police Department and the Fire Department in the prior budgets that we have seen there has been an assumption that they would have 100%...actually the first salary adjustment account funding we saw did not even take care of the needs of just the Police and Fire Department but that assumed there was never going to be...

Mayor Guinta interjected I disagree with that. That is out of order.

Alderman DeVries asked your Honor are you going to continue to interrupt us.

Mayor Guinta responded excuse me. I don't want you to say at a public meeting what you just said because it is inaccurate. If you are going to make statements please base them on fact.

Alderman DeVries asked why don't we offer the Fire Chief to come up and we can start like we are at our number one budget meeting again. I mean when we had our first budget

meetings the Fire Department indicated to us that they needed a salary adjustment amount of close to \$700,000 if my memory serves me. With Police at that point in time it was \$1.3 million between those two departments your Honor.

Mayor Guinta stated well we have Police here now and you can bring up Fire next.

Alderman DeVries responded let's. Why are you interrupting us? We are revisiting old facts your Honor that we covered months ago in our Finance Committee meetings.

Mayor Guinta stated we are dealing with the budget. If you want to deal with the budget and fact then please continue.

Alderman DeVries asked why don't I defer to...Alderman Lopez do you have all of the original sheets in front of you. Is your recollection...Chief Kane I guess you are going to be pulled in and let's bring in Frank Thomas? Is Frank Thomas with us?

Mayor Guinta asked is there a question from the Alderman for the Police Chief.

Alderman DeVries answered absolutely. Is that what you are bringing this down to your Honor? You won't let me continue my statement?

Mayor Guinta responded I just said continue your conversations as long as it is based on fact. You have the Police Chief in front of you.

Alderman DeVries asked Chief with the Mayor's budget your salary shortfall with the \$1 million original budget how much did you need to have your full complement with the six new hires.

Chief Jaskolka responded I am not sure I understand what you are asking.

Alderman DeVries asked with the initial budget that the Mayor presented how much of the salary adjustment account were you planning on utilizing.

Chief Jaskolka answered with the original numbers, again high end at full complement for the year it would be \$250,000.

Alderman DeVries asked Chief Kane.

Joseph Kane, Fire Chief, answered my number was \$717,000.

Mayor Guinta stated and if you put the \$1 million in there and you allow me to manage the entire City attrition rather than just a few departments you wouldn't have a problem. Again, it is a business philosophy that clearly some Aldermen can't get their hands around.

Alderman DeVries stated so your Honor you were at \$1 million between Police and Fire. What we have done is we have properly funded their dedicated line item requests...

Mayor Guinta interjected no you haven't. Both of these gentlemen have said that it is not there under the proposal in front of them and the problem I am trying to reiterate, which is an administrative problem with the budget, is that with \$400,000 in salary adjustment you are greatly reducing the flexibility of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen to manage the entire attrition rate. It is just impossible and I wish you could understand how a salary adjustment works. You can't do it only in a few departments. You have to take the entire salary line of the City, which is \$60 million.

Alderman DeVries stated may I suggest your Honor that you step down if you are going to continue to debate us. We do understand the budget. We have spent many, many hours going back through this with each of the departments to make sure that their requests were on a very lean side but at least they had a manageable point – the Tax Collector and the Highway Department and the rest of our services will be lean but they will be kept intact. Our citizens can expect to have some ability to have their services fulfilled. The Fire Department...where are you going to be at with Alderman Lopez's budget request? What are you going to be requesting on salary alone?

Chief Kane responded it is kind of hard to deal with just that number but it looks like Alderman Lopez put the money back into my account.

Alderman DeVries stated so now we are dealing with a \$250,000 shortfall and we are funding it above \$250,000 for Police and Fire. We are leaving a buffer of several hundred thousand dollars in that, maybe \$150,000. Your buffer was about \$60,000 for these two departments alone. Your Honor I do not think you can say that we are not allowing you to continue to manage the vacancies throughout the City. Other than the Highway Department that has been cut 3% and said this is his lean number leave me at this very lean request and I can manage my account and if we need to hear back from the Highway Department we can bring them back up to the table.

Mayor Guinta responded that is up to you, Alderman. If you want to bring Highway up that is fine with me.

Alderman DeVries stated we are leaving more available for you to manage with in the salary adjustment account than what you had in your original proposal.

Mayor Guinta replied you are putting \$400,000 in. That is less than the \$1 million and less than the \$1.7 million.

Alderman DeVries stated we have funded the departments.

Mayor Guinta responded well I have department heads who are saying you are not.

Alderman DeVries stated we have two departments here that previously were looking for \$967,000 from you in a salary adjustment account of \$1 million. They just told me between them \$250,000 in a salary adjustment account of \$400,000.

Mayor Guinta stated it leaves \$150,000 for the entire City.

Alderman DeVries responded I can do the math. Your Honor, it is not our intent to argue this with you. We have, as I think Alderman Roy tried to state, philosophically we come from a little different place.

Mayor Guinta stated that's right. I would like to manage and have tax cuts and it looks like what you are trying to do is give me...essentially there is an inability to do that based on the appropriation in the salary adjustment. I said, and I will reiterate it for every Aldermen, during this budget process we talked extensively about salary adjustment. I said if you are not comfortable with the salary adjustment number, bump it up, find some dollars in the existing framework of either my appropriation or what happens between March and now because you get new revenues and new valuations, to make that adjustment whole. In a sense what you have done is reduced it.

Alderman DeVries stated if I can just make one final comment and then certainly I will relinquish. We do feel that we have funded throughout the City all of the departments in a lean way. We do feel that our department heads are well paid, well educated and well prepared to manage, along with the Mayor, the vacancy rates that they have. Every department with the exception of Highway will be managing with the Mayor.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to clarify one thing. The \$717,000 that the Fire Chief indicated he was short and we had an exercise with the Finance Officer and the Chief and other people and I don't want to go into too much detail but there was \$275,725 that was in the restricted line item that really should have gone into salaries so that made him short \$441,275. It wasn't \$717,000. The confusion of all of the paperwork I can understand. They put all of the money into the salary restricted items when they should have put 2/3 into salaries and taken 1/3 in this particular case and put \$137,863 only in restricted items. I think that was a lot of confusion so when we added more money to the Fire Department I think that he can manage. He has been able to manage for the six years I have been here. Is it going to be tough? It is going to be very tough. Very tough. This budget is probably the

toughest budget that some of us put together and believe me it is going to be very responsible and very accountable for every department head. Now the \$400,000 that you have in salary adjustment if I may address that and the \$300,000 in contingency because I was able to get another \$100,000 the first thing I said was let's put another \$100,000 in contingency. You have \$700,000 for two departments. I don't expect any other department to come back and ask you for any money out of the salary adjustment account. For unforeseen reasons maybe but I don't expect that. They are going to manage their departments. They are entitled to manage their department. If not, we don't need department heads and we don't need deputies and we don't need anybody. We can just do everything through the Mayor's Office and you can run it out of there.

Mayor Guinta stated excuse me Alderman but that is not the purpose of the salary adjustment okay. We have department heads in this City that the Mayor relies on and that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen rely on. What I am asking departments to do is manage more efficiently and work with myself to manage more efficiently. One of the things we have to get our hands around is the overall salary number for the City. As everyone on this Board knows, we have contract issues coming up and Yarger Decker issues that had been discussed. The previous Board I think entered into some sort of fact-finding mission about Yarger Decker and its implications to the budget in future years. These are issues we have to address so the salary adjustment line is specifically targeted to try and get our hands around where the resources should be in the City. It is step one of performance management that we are hopefully going to be bringing into the City for next year's budget.

Alderman Lopez responded I thank you for that. I want to assure you as I have done with the Parking Enterprise and moving the Traffic Division and all of that, I assure you that I will work with you in accomplishing whatever goals is going to improve the efficiency in the City of Manchester. We are going to take a look at it. That is why we have the Committees to scrutinize different things and I can assure you that the Aldermen I have talked to are willing to work with you but it's not going to happen overnight.

Mayor Guinta replied I have no doubt that you are looking to work with me and the Aldermen to look for efficiencies and that is something that I appreciate and something that I am glad to say this Board is obviously looking at. The concern I do have is the lack of flexibility within that one line item based on the other...based on the reallocation of the original dollars. About a month ago or six weeks ago the direction of this Board was to increase salary adjustment. That was done in Alderman Gatsas' proposal and now it has gone the other way. It is going to take me a little time to go through these numbers and determine what the percentages are to make sure that it is workable.

Alderman Lopez stated the other thing is that I think as a caution as you move along and get the vacancy requests from other departments you will manage that and that money will be there because the department heads can't spend the salary or restricted money. So the

department heads, just like we do now when Kevin goes and raids every department on June 30 and then balances the budget.

Mayor Guinta responded the challenge I think is that the largest department is excluded from that so now we are looking at balancing the attrition solely on departments like the Office of Youth Services, Solicitor...I mean some of the smaller like Planning and Economic Development offices that are significantly smaller and also are a very small percentage of the entire appropriation for the salary number.

Alderman Lopez replied I don't expect those departments to come back and ask you for any money. They are funded.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think one of the things we can agree on is that we respectfully disagree with each other on the discussion of salary adjustment and in my particular case especially where it is related to Police and Fire. We have many, many challenges in both departments and I, for one, believe that we should give them the proper amount of money to do the job. I believe the numbers that are presented here will allow them to do that. There will not be any reduction in services. I respectfully disagree with you regarding the philosophy of the salary adjustment related to two of our three largest City departments. We did have the Highway Department that stepped up to the plate and said give us a number and we will take the reduction but let us manage within the budget. I fully support that and I have full faith in our Public Works Department in managing within that budget and that they will not be coming back for salary adjustment. Frank Thomas said that and Kevin Sheppard is here to confirm that. Their intention is they are not coming back for salary adjustment based on the number that is presented here.

Alderman Duval stated just perhaps given the conversation we had today...we had a lengthy discussion in your office today and I have to be honest with my colleagues here on the Board that the Mayor makes a real solid case one-on-one. He really does. He has some good ideas with respect to salary adjustment and I think it should be heard. I also addressed the Mayor today that perhaps not enough time was spent one-on-one or in small groups with the Mayor so that he could make his point as well as he made it with me since the start of this budget discussion. I think over time perhaps we can improve in that area. I think there is value in what the Mayor has presented. As a practical matter I don't think we are going to accomplish it in this budget session – everything that the Mayor has set out to accomplish. I would like to focus for a minute on what we do agree on and I think there are a whole host of things. I think Alderman O'Neil highlighted some of those earlier this evening but the Mayor's proposed parking enterprise. I think the Board is in agreement and I don't know if it is unanimous but a majority of us are in favor of forming a parking enterprise. We have agreed on the consolidation of Traffic into Highway. I understand this has been discussed in prior years without success and that has been accomplished. With regard to a whole host of other areas we agree and I think we should focus on that this evening. Alderman Gatsas has

guided us through the budget deliberation process. It has been lengthy and it has been thorough I believe. As a new Alderman I can feel very comfortable and assured with the information that I have gathered throughout the budget process that this is a very fair and well thought out budget and has the fingerprint of everyone on this Board really. Half of the line items in this budget, just as an observation, were brought to this Board by either Alderman Gatsas or the Mayor. I think that is good. The other half were a result of a contribution from a number of different Aldermen on this Board – probably every Alderman. I think it is a responsible budget. It is not perfect. I chatted with the Mayor today and I am not satisfied. I don't think we should stop here if we are pursuing efficiencies. I don't think we can get to all of the efficiencies prudently, thoroughly and fairly through the budget process. We just can't do it. It is not possible. At least I concluded that in completing this, my first budget. We have a lot more work to do and I think that if we support this as a compromise budget, which yields less than a 1% increase in taxes, which I think is reasonably fair taxation...again I don't think there is anyone on this Board that is looking for a tax increase but we all have to respond to calls day in and day out regarding constituent services. Every day I get six or eight calls left on my answering machine from people who need services, whether they are school related or street related or whatever it is. People are calling for services and we, as Ward Aldermen, have to respond to these requests. It is not perfect and there are places to go at the end of this budget session. I mentioned today with the Mayor I think with all due respect to Chief Kane and the way he runs his department I think there needs to be better communication and a better understanding of how the Fire Department is run so we can get our arms around the huge number for overtime. Efficiencies at the Highway Department in my opinion should be a priority with all due respect to that department head. I think it is high time we start investing in single man trucks and move down from three man trucks for refuse collection. It may be a hot button issue but I think it is high time we take a look at it. Just last if I may with regard to the School District budget I said a couple of times that there are 14 elected officials that represent the School District. We have to have some regard for them and we have to have a certain level of respect for the positions they hold. To a very large extend I have relied and based my support of \$145.5 million on what I have been told by a number of different School Board members – not just one or two but I think a really good cross-section of representatives from the School Committee. A number of them have been very candid with me and I think if you take a look at the budget number proposed in this budget while I can't say as an Alderman that I know exactly what that number should be, I am reasonably assured that that number should fund the essential positions that are required in the School District and it is below what was proposed by the School Finance Committee. I think it is, again, responsible. However, I would like to focus on what we agree on and what we have come to versus creating rank or highlighting the areas where we disagree.

Alderman Gatsas stated I am just trying to get to a compromise because politics is always the art of compromise. I am trying to get to a zero number and I am going to ask my colleagues

to work with me on some of the basis so that we can get there. I will assume that the county budget is going to be less than what it was in FY06 correct?

Mayor Guinta responded this \$10.2 million is a new reflection of their needs.

Alderman Gatsas asked so there need is less than what it was in FY06.

Mayor Guinta answered a little bit yes.

Alderman Gatsas stated well I would think that if the county could live with under what they had in FY06 then we as a City should certainly be able to live with less than what we spent in FY06 but I can see we are not there. I guess basically where we are is somewhere in the vicinity of getting the Mayor back some \$600,000 to allocate in the salary adjustment line and some way to get the taxpayers back roughly \$1.1 million to get them back to a zero number. Now I would think that in a \$250 million budget that trying to find \$1.7 million should not be a difficult task. So with that I would like to say maybe we could recess this meeting, take a day and maybe we could come back so that everybody at least has worked together to see if we can get something that makes sense in a compromise – one for a zero budget and meeting the needs that we need to meet. With that, we are not that far away from being able to do it so I think we ought to take at least one day to put some thought process together on how we can get there.

Mayor Guinta stated before we recess for the evening I do want to recess for about 30 minutes.

Alderman Lopez asked who said we were recessing your Honor.

Mayor Guinta answered well Alderman Gatsas has recommended recessing until tomorrow but I actually would like to recess for 30 minutes so I can go through these numbers beyond the hour that I have had to look at them. Unless there is an objection I would like to recess for 30 minutes.

Alderman Lopez replied I just don't understand why you want to recess because the numbers are what they are. We put a lot of work into this. This is the Aldermen's budget, not the Mayor's budget.

Mayor Guinta responded I have had this for one hour. You are asking me to administer a budget of \$155 million after looking at it for one hour. I think in fairness that a 30-minute recess would not be out of order.

Alderman Lopez stated I will leave that up to my colleagues.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't necessarily have a problem with that, your Honor. I don't know that what you are going to come back with is going to change any thinking. I have been here Saturdays and nights until midnight. I am not coming back tomorrow night. I am ready tonight. I spent hours meeting with departments to try to come up with a number that is responsible here. Another night is not going to make a difference to me so I will not be coming back here tomorrow night with all due respect to my colleague from Ward 2.

Alderman Gatsas stated well let's do it tonight then.

Alderman O'Neil responded I am ready. I will stay here all night.

Mayor Guinta stated I am asking for a 30-minute recess so I can have the benefit of reviewing this a little more thoroughly than through the Chair's position. It is a little challenging to have a budget presented to me with 24 hours left and the BMA expect me to just say yea or nay. I would like to have some time to take a look at it.

Alderman Duval stated I would like to respectfully ask my colleagues to allow the Mayor the 30 minutes to take a look at the budget. If the Chairman of the Board is okay with it, I am fine with it. I think that it wouldn't hurt for us to take a step back.

Mayor Guinta called for a 30-minute recess.

Mayor Guinta called the meeting back to order.

Mayor Guinta asked is there further discussion from the Board regarding this item. I had an opportunity to take a look at the proposal before us. I would like to reiterate that I still want to reserve some concerns regarding the amount of time that I had to take a look at it but in the hour or so that I was able to go through each line item I still have some concerns and I want to talk about them because the administrative side of this budget is very important. Before I get into that I think I have learned a number of things during this process and I hope that the City of Manchester is better for this process. One of the goals that I had and will continue to have is to have a very transparent process in the City of Manchester. I would like to see the Board of Mayor and Aldermen continue to work together to try to find the efficiencies that we all know exist in City government. I think we have great employees and great department heads but there is always a manner in which I believe we can improve the delivery of services, which is the business that the City of Manchester is in. I do believe we have a fiduciary responsibility to act properly and honestly and I think we have done that. I also think we have an obligation to taxpayers to only collect what we need to collect to provide the services in this community. Now we can continue to have a debate over what the services are that we would like to perform and I am certain that we would like to provide and I am looking forward to the performance based management system next year to really depoliticize the process as much as it can be depoliticized and focus on the activities and the

functions of the City of Manchester and how we perform those functions. I do want to commend the Aldermen for working over the past four months to try to come up with what I think the taxpayers have asked for. I think the Aldermen have done a good job with this budget. I think they have listened to the concerns of their constituents. I would have hoped that we could have identified a way to provide tax relief to the citizens of the City but I think in large part there was a shift in the thinking at City Hall and I am pleased with that. I am not ready to end there. I am going to continue to try to have this focus on how we can improve service and how we can use less of the resources to provide the same level of service because I think at the very least the citizens of the City deserve better. I am overall pleased with how the Aldermen have shown their willingness to start the dialogue on efficiencies for delivering services with less dollars. I think we are close. I would have hoped that by tonight we would have been a little closer to a tax cut but it appears that this is as close as the Board is going to get. I respect it but I will continue to fight and advocate for tax relief as we move forward. There are a couple of things that I do want to identify as concerns from an administrative side of this budget. As I went through each line item during the recess, and this is why I believe the salary adjustment is such a critical issue, if you take each department and try to make them whole we come up with a \$1.3 million difference with only \$400,000 in the salary adjustment line to cover it. Now I will do everything I can to manage that number. I do feel that we need as a matter of policy the entire salary line to do that. I am going to do it to the best of my ability because that is a fiduciary responsibility that I have. As you add up the numbers, it does come to \$1.3 million. The other concerns I have are the valuation number and taking the high end at \$90 million, which is an extra \$140,000 in revenue. If we don't meet that, there is going to be a \$140,000 shortfall. During this process I did take a more conservative number. I do think we should continue with a conservative number but I hope that we can achieve that number through equity in the property valuation and through no other method. The other two very big concerns I have are the \$300,000 that has been added in revenue for Saturday parking and the \$300,000 in revenue for the \$3 charge for each person who registers a vehicle in the City. I think that those are hidden fees or hidden taxes that quite frankly this community can't afford when you look at the overall tax structure of our community. However, if those philosophies and policies are not adopted I can assure you that there is going to have to be an adjustment in the tax rate when it is set later this year. We are also going to continue, I believe, as a Board to work through the summer and continue to find efficiencies whether it comes from my office or any Aldermen. Any efficiency in the City of Manchester to improve the City is welcome. I would also encourage the citizens of the City to continue speaking with my office and every Aldermen to identify more efficient ways that we can deliver service. That being said, I will go back to the Aldermen and take a motion.

Alderman Lopez stated in the spirit of compromise as we discussed it has come to my attention that there is \$35,000 in revenue that was added and I understand the operation that you are trying to do in the Mayor's Office and in the spirit of cooperation I would like to

amend that and put \$35,000 in the Health Department as revenue and put the other \$35,000 as expenditure and if the City Finance Office will approve the number I would appreciate it.

Alderman Lopez moved to amend the MTA resolution from \$850,000 to \$1.1 million.

Alderman Roy duly seconded the motion. Mayor Guinta called for a vote. Alderman Gatsas requested a roll call vote. Aldermen Gatsas, Shea, and Garrity voted nay. Aldermen Long, Duval, Osborne, Pinard, O'Neil, Lopez, DeVries, Smith, Thibault, Forest and Roy voted yea. The motion carried.

Alderman Lopez moved to enroll the Appropriating Resolution as amended. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion. Mayor Guinta called for a vote. The motion carried with Aldermen Gatsas, Shea and Garrity being duly recorded in opposition.

Appropriating Resolution:

“Amending a Resolution ‘A Resolution appropriating to the Parking Fund the sum of \$6,603,825 from Parking for the Fiscal Year 2007.’ to \$6,903,825.”

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil it was voted to read the Resolution by title only, and it was so done.

Alderman Lopez moved to amend the Resolution to \$7,233,825. Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion.

Mayor Guinta asked can you just provide a clarification as to what the amendment represents.

Alderman Lopez answered the amendment represents the \$3 increase in the registration fee for vehicles and that goes into the Finance Office.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the Clerk would note that it would be under the line item expenses on the resolution. You are adding \$330,000 as I understand it. If you go to the attachment line item expenses would now be \$5,631,175.

Mayor Guinta asked and that assumes 12 months of additional revenue.

Alderman Lopez answered that is correct and we will be taking that resolution up in the first meeting in July.

Alderman Gatsas requested a roll call vote.

Alderman Gatsas stated I have a parliamentary question. A vote yes for this would be to increase everybody's car registration by \$3 that registers their car in the City of Manchester

so anybody who wants to make the choice of whether they register their car rental in Manchester or Londonderry can so move?

Mayor Guinta responded that would be correct.

Alderman Lopez stated I have a point of clarification.

Alderman Gatsas replied we are in a voting mode.

Alderman Lopez responded you had a parliamentary question and you made a clarification and I want to make a clarification. Also along that line the money that we receive will take care of the parking lots and places where there are meters. That is where the money goes so it benefits the taxpayers.

Aldermen Gatsas, Pinard, Shea and Garrity voted nay. Aldermen Long, Duval, Osborne, O'Neil, Lopez, DeVries, Smith, Thibault, Forest and Roy voted yea. The motion carried.

Mayor Guinta stated I am going to exercise the veto on that because I do believe that we should not be increasing the fee for people registering their vehicles in the City of Manchester and I am also very concerned about the direction or the message that you are sending to fleets that are registered in the City at the Airport. They could go to Londonderry, which could have an adverse effect on this expected revenue.

Alderman DeVries stated I would like to have a recess.

Alderman Lopez asked can we have a three-minute recess your Honor.

Mayor Guinta asked for what purpose would the recess be.

Alderman Gatsas stated we are in a voting mode.

Alderman DeVries responded I don't think that prohibits us.

Alderman Gatsas replied sure it does. We are in a voting mode.

Alderman Lopez stated well I move to override the veto.

Mayor Guinta stated I haven't made a decision yet. I was asking a clarifying question. These are budget votes and I want to give everyone the opportunity to make the correct vote so if there is a legitimate reason for the recess I am inclined to grant it. I just wanted to have that question answered.

Alderman DeVries stated I am looking for some clarification. First I would ask the City Clerk is that a viable motion.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated it is up to the Chair as to whether or not he would want to accept a motion to recess.

Mayor Guinta called for a three-minute recess.

Mayor Guinta called the meeting back to order.

Mayor Guinta asked is there further action on item 14.

Alderman Lopez stated I think we completed Item 14.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated no, you had a motion to amend to \$7,233,825, which was vetoed by the Mayor.

Alderman Lopez moved to override the Mayor's veto. Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion. Alderman Gatsas requested a roll call vote. Aldermen Gatsas, Pinard, Shea and Garrity voted nay. Aldermen Long, Duval, Osborne, O'Neil, Lopez, DeVries, Smith, Thibault, Forest and Roy voted yea. The motion carried.

Alderman Roy moved that the Appropriating Resolution pass and be Enrolled as amended. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion. Mayor Guinta called for a vote. The motion carried with Aldermen Gatsas, Pinard, Shea and Garrity being duly recorded in opposition.

Appropriating Resolution:

“Amending a Resolution ‘Raising Monies and Making Appropriations for the Fiscal Year 2007’ to \$117,990,110.”

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez it was voted to read the Resolution by title only, and it was so done.

Alderman Lopez moved to amend the Resolution to \$117,561,960. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Gatsas stated so if the number of \$117,561,960 is a \$3 increase for every person that registers his or her car in the City of Manchester then we should be opposed to that your Honor.

Mayor Guinta responded so noted.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated just for the record the Clerk would note that the \$117,561,960 as we are understanding it would be the same as the handout at \$117,526,960 adding \$35,000 to the Health Department line item.

Randy Sherman, Deputy Finance Officer, stated the \$35,000 is going into the Mayor's Office as an expense.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson noted the clarification.

Mayor Guinta called for a vote. Alderman Garrity requested a roll call vote. Aldermen Garrity, Gatsas, Pinard, and Shea voted nay. Aldermen Smith, Thibault, Forest, Roy, Long, Duval, Osborne, O'Neil, Lopez and DeVries voted yea. The motion carried.

Mayor Guinta stated I will again exercise my veto based on the fact that I would have hoped that this Board could have been a little more stringent in terms of spending and identified additional efficiencies in the City.

Alderman O'Neil moved to override the Mayor's veto. Alderman Roy duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Gatsas stated my understanding is the Aldermen that have put this number together have gotten guarantees from Fire that there won't be a ladder truck down and Chief Kane I am going to call you every day. You can depend on that. Every day I am going to call you.

Alderman Forest stated you Honor I don't think an Alderman should be making threats for a department head.

Alderman Gatsas responded that is not a threat Alderman. That is a promise.

Alderman Forest stated it sounds like a threat to me.

Alderman Gatsas replied that is not a threat it is a promise because we were told by the Aldermen that put this budget together there wouldn't be a ladder truck put down.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think there needs to be a key word – intentional closing of a ladder truck because unfortunately they are mechanical machines. They break down and we don't have a spare ladder truck so there are going to be times when for mechanical reasons...Chief that can be anywhere from a day to a month or two right depending on what happens to it so we need to be clear. I think the intent is that there will be no intentional closing of ladder trucks. There are times when he just can't do anything about it. A piston breaks on a ladder

truck. He can't do anything about that. It is pretty clear. He shouldn't be criticized over something he has no control over.

Mayor Guinta stated I think Alderman Gatsas' point is that as a result of the budget that has been presented today by some of the Aldermen.

Alderman O'Neil stated something that didn't happen last year that I hope the Police Department takes into serious consideration is last year we funded a position to do traffic, parking and speed enforcement in the evening hours and because of complement issues the position never got filled. I am of the opinion that pretty soon when those 13 are available that should be happening Day 1. That position was funded and I expect that that enforcement will be carried out. I need to take that back. Forget the 13. That was in an existing number so I hope that is given strong consideration your Honor.

Alderman DeVries stated I will just reiterate what has been said that there are circumstances when pieces of apparatus need to be out of service that are beyond the Chief's control but above and beyond that and the Police Department the speed enforcement position that was not filled I also would like to note that there should not be defunding or not filling of community policing positions. With the gang activities we have had in the City that is an essential operation and I would certainly hope that the Police Department would not consider making their savings within their budget by not filling those positions.

Alderman O'Neil requested a roll call vote on the motion to override the Mayor's veto. Aldermen O'Neil, Lopez, DeVries, Smith, Thibault, Forest, Roy, Long, Duval, and Osborne voted yea. Aldermen Shea, Garrity, Gatsas and Pinard voted nay. The motion carried.

Alderman Roy moved that the Appropriating Resolution pass and be Enrolled as amended. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion. Mayor Guinta called for a vote. The motion carried with Aldermen Gatsas, Pinard, Shea and Garrity being duly recorded in opposition.

Appropriating Resolution:

“A Resolution appropriating to the Manchester School Food and Nutrition Services Program the sum of \$5,537,900 from School Food and Nutrition Services Revenues for Fiscal Year 2007.”

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault it was voted to read the Resolution by title only, and it was so done.

Alderman Long moved that the Appropriating Resolution pass and be Enrolled. Alderman DeVries duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Gatsas asked there is no amendment here. I would have thought if we are charging everybody an additional \$3 we might charge the kids in the School District another 25 cents for their meals.

Alderman Lopez answered we don't have that authority.

Mayor Guinta called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Appropriating Resolution:

“A Resolution appropriating to the Manchester School District the sum of \$143,000,000 for the Fiscal Year 2007.”

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault it was voted to read the Resolution by title only, and it was so done.

Alderman Lopez moved to amend the Resolution to \$145,500,000. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Gatsas stated now I haven't got direct contact but I would assume that the statements that were made by Alderman Lopez at the beginning of the meeting that no teachers were going to be laid off and the Ombudsman Program was going to continue...all of those facts are going to continue. All of those facts like no school athletics being cut. Those facts will continue because that is what was said before this Board tonight. That at \$145.5 million they were assured that none of those things would happen.

Alderman O'Neil responded I don't know if they were assured because I didn't have that conversation. It is my opinion that based on the number that I am going to vote for tonight none of those things should be cut and I will be very, very disappointed if those things happen under the \$145.5 million number. They should not happen. Athletics should be fully funded and the special programs that we talked about like Ombudsman, STAY, etc. should be fully funded and no district employee should be let go on the \$145.5 million.

Mayor Guinta stated Alderman O'Neil none of those programs should be cut under any number and as far as I am concerned when the next budget process begins I would like to have a little truth in budgeting from the presenters of the budget because as far as I am concerned not opening up your books to the appropriating body is an inappropriate way to try to budget and work with the City of Manchester and the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Alderman Gatsas stated I certainly understand where my colleague is coming from but I served on the Board with him about four years ago when we put \$1 million into the school budget for maintenance and I will remind my colleague that that \$1 million as I told everybody was a bottom line number and we had no authority or jurisdiction on what was

going to be done and what wasn't going to be done and the \$1 million in maintenance never happened.

Alderman O'Neil replied I absolutely agree with my colleague that that happened and no matter what we end up doing after the vote on whatever the number is here I think we need to take a vote to send a strong message on what is expected here.

Mayor Guinta stated I would accept that motion.

Alderman Duval stated I think there would be consensus that the School District and specifically the School Committee look for alternative ways to live within the budget that is being voted on tonight without the need to lay off any teachers or cut into the athletic school budget. There is an opportunity to revisit some votes that were made in the past perhaps. I know there has been a lot of questions raised about the increase in salaries because of the elevation of certain directors to Assistant Superintendent status and perhaps that is one avenue that the School Committee should take and I would encourage them to look at that.

Alderman Smith stated in response to Alderman Gatsas I did come up with this figure and I will tell you how I did it. The School Board voted for \$148 million. The Mayor's budget was \$143 million and I split it. That is where the \$145.5 million comes from. There are no guarantees with this budget but I am sure the good doctor and the educators will take care of the teachers. I would just like to make a point. No offense Mayor but this is your budget from last year – 15 additional teachers in Manchester schools and 10.5 additional administrators. Let's not pass the buck. Education is important so let's fund it and let's fund it fully.

Alderman Lopez stated for the record I am not guaranteeing anything Alderman Gatsas but I am very comfortable that no teachers are going to be laid off and as I indicated in my remarks I would be very amazed if one teacher is laid off. I think they received the message loud and clear from the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. They have some tough choices to make. There is no question about it. Probably the toughest choices they are ever going to make and it is their responsibility and one other point...I do agree with the Mayor. I don't care if they have to do it by hand but we want a line item budget next year and I suggest that you get it your Honor.

Alderman Roy stated I don't like this number and I definitely didn't like the original number. I am voting for the \$145.5 million tonight because it seems like it is a compromise number and the highest number that can be passed. I do have a significant problem with our process and you touched up on it with the truth in budgeting. There is an impact to every family in the City whether their child is in the School District or they are a School District employee that when politics are played with people's lives people go out and try to find security. There are excellent educators and district employees who have gone out and sent out their

resumes to other districts because of the insecurity of the jobs in Manchester, which seems to be more of a political process than an actual dollar and budgetary process. I would ask the School Board members that are here tonight and the Administrators that are watching and my colleagues here let's start early next year. Let's get a number that we can get to a compromise on and work on a line item budget with the School Board so that when it comes to this point people aren't waiting until 8 PM or 9 PM on the night before the budget has to be done to find out if they have a job come July 2. I find it appalling that the pink slips and the district employee lay-offs were done as part of this political process.

Alderman Long stated your Honor you hit the key point there. Their line items weren't presented to us. That was a difficult process going in. I met four times with Dr. Ludwell and through this process what I find flawed is the fact that there are teachers calling and thanking me for my support when it should be the other way around. I should be thanking them for what they do for our school district. This was throughout this whole process – either departments or employees of our City thanking me for giving them support when I should be the one, in fact, thanking them for the work that they provide to the City of Manchester.

Mayor Guinta stated I think there is a motion on the table.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the motion on the floor is to amend the Resolution to \$145,500,000.

Mayor Guinta called for a vote. Alderman Gatsas requested a roll call. Aldermen Gatsas, Pinard, Shea, and Garrity voted nay. Aldermen Long, Duval, Osborne, O'Neil, Lopez, DeVries, Smith, Thibault, Forest and Roy voted yea. The motion carried.

Mayor Guinta vetoed the action stating while I appreciate the Board's commitment to try to guess what the appropriate dollar amount is to the schools I am going to veto for two reasons. I am still not convinced that the Administration has provided us full documentation so we could make a clear and concise decision and secondly I am extremely disappointed in the amount of money that is spent on administrative costs when we should be focusing on trying to increase direct classroom instruction. Nobody in this room can convince me that we are going to improve test scores and improve the quality of education unless we improve direct classroom instruction. In my opinion, this is a position of standing with the teachers. It is standing with educators. It is demanding the accountability that I don't believe exists today and I certainly hope will exist at the beginning of the next budget process.

Alderman Forest moved to override the Mayor's veto. Alderman Roy duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Gatsas stated I think you hit the nail on the head when you talked about test scores because I am sure tomorrow morning we are all going to open up the newspaper and find out

the test scores that have been allocated in the State of NH were incorrect. The test scores that we saw aren't going to be the test scores that are going to be coming back. I would say to you, your Honor, you are right because if somebody said to me that the test scores were going to go up 50% or 100% if we allocated \$170 million so that the kids in Manchester would be better educated I probably could support that but if it is about money and we are looking at test scores then those are two different issues. I think that tomorrow when we all wake up and read the paper we might be disillusioned about test scores.

Alderman Long stated a couple of Aldermen have already alluded to the fact that we are looking for the same process that you are looking for your Honor. Administration needs to take a hard look at itself. That is why we are sending a strong message here tonight that the cuts with respect to the Ombudsman, STAY and PASS program, TAP program, and athletics should not be cut. In that vein as you had mentioned, let them look at the administrative...what is heavy administratively and not at what directly affects the students.

Mayor Guinta replied I will just echo that by saying myself and this Board spent four to six months doing that very same thing on the City side and we would like to appropriate the dollars necessary on the City side and School side; everyone in this room. Everyone in this room is in favor of education but I think what some people would like to see is a little more accountability on both sides. Again, I appreciate the Board's support in looking for that accountability. I will work with this Board and the administration to provide a true line item budget so this Board can make accurate reflections of the needs of our community.

Alderman Lopez stated with that I would ask you not to wait a day to tell them how you want to do your budget next year so they can start now.

Alderman DeVries stated it does bother me how quickly this Board forgets though. Recently in the paper we saw with the refugee situation that there was over \$2 million that the School District has to spend today that it didn't have to spend five years ago on the education of the refugee students because of the recent rise of numbers. I am not on the School Board. I can't tell you exactly the years that that has increased but it has been just over the last few years that this number is out of control for them to provide interpretation services for the influx of new students into their district. We also learned that \$1.9 million is a set aside number because they did not meet their adequate yearly progress.

Mayor Guinta stated \$1.3 million.

Alderman DeVries responded the AYP.

Mayor Guinta replied it is \$1.3 million. I think you said \$1.9 million.

Alderman DeVries stated I did say \$1.9 million. In any case it is over \$1 million that they have to put aside because they did not last year meet adequate yearly progress. That is money that...we are criticizing them for not being frugal enough but we cannot forget yesterday's headlines or the day before's headlines for the School District. They have a lot of challenges. The schoolteachers are working very hard to do more with less. The classroom sizes are growing. We need to be doing everything we can for education while keeping it in line and responsible to our taxpayers and I think that is what this budget has done of \$145.5 million. I do not think we should be criticizing it. Remember, this is \$500,000 less than the Finance Chair recommended to the School District. The lowest number recommended by the School Board was \$146 million. We have come in lower than that. This is a very frugal budget we are asking them to live under.

Mayor Guinta responded the point I would make is this should be about direct classroom instruction and increasing the dollars in direct classroom instruction but what it requires is a review of how we appropriate and utilize our dollars. The second point is the \$2.7 million that we are using versus the \$300,000 we are getting from the federal government, it is part of my job as Mayor to work with the federal delegation and the federal government to provide what is adequate. That is something that I have talked to the high school principals about and other principals throughout the City to try to identify areas of improvement. That is something that we are going to be working on over the summer so hopefully that issue is addressed. There are some challenges that the School District has that I think we agree they have, however, it doesn't in my opinion excuse not providing us with all of the financial information that has been asked for.

Alderman DeVries replied I certainly didn't say that they shouldn't be providing you the detail. That was not my point at all.

Alderman Roy stated as much as we are talking about the \$143 million and the \$145.5 million number, it is the higher numbers that we should be worried about. Numbers like the drop out rate going up and numbers like the class sizes going up. We are talking about the impacts of classroom services but when you talk about running the Ombudsman program and working on the drop out rate those factors don't always come into direct classroom services and with all due respect, Mayor...

Mayor Guinta interjected that is direct classroom instruction Alderman.

Alderman Roy replied for the actual people in the classroom but there are coordinators and staffing that...

Mayor Guinta interjected Alderman that is part of direct classroom instruction.

Alderman Roy stated we won't debate it now but my point is when you look at your programs that are affected, take a year and let's work on the budget starting tomorrow. Let's work with the School District to get a line item budget and I think you will find a Board that is very agreeable to making frugal cuts when it can be proven that they are justified and when we talk about teachers and programs to reduce our drop out rate and reduce our class sizes, you won't find the support unless there is concrete evidence that it can happen with a lower number.

Mayor Guinta responded we are talking about rededicating appropriated dollars into direct classroom instruction. That is what I think teachers and parents and students are looking for just to clarify the point.

Alderman Smith stated not to go on all night long but I would just like to before the vote is taken say that in the course of a day the teachers are expected to be a counselor, a parent, a nurse and at the same time a teacher. There are so many dedicated teachers in our system and we need to provide them with the tools to go forward and not to regress. I feel that we need to invest in our schools and not cut back. I really believe this and a good example of that is the Beech Street School and you know the problems we have there.

Alderman O'Neil stated this is probably our one real time in the spotlight of talking about schools and not talking about buildings and that and I just think there can be a lot of emphasis on test scores and how much money we put into it but I look at what our teachers do every single day and to me whether some of these schools meet their test scores or not I know they are making a difference in the lives of the kids in this City and being the one night that we are having this discussion I just want to thank them because they make a difference whether it is a school in the most affluent section of the City or the poorest section. They make a difference in those kids lives and I think that is the most important thing in this discussion. Thank you.

Alderman Gatsas stated I have a letter here from Mary Heath who, if we don't remember, used to be in the School District. I respect her. She is now at the Department of Education at the state level. I asked her about the funds in Title I and Title II that the School District is going to get and I just want to remind my colleague, Alderman DeVries, that the state allocates \$1,000 for every child that is in the ESL program so the City of Manchester receives about \$3.3 million from the state for the ESL program. That is part of the \$45 million that we receive in a grant from the state. I look at these numbers and in 2005 there was \$11.8 million that was received from federal funds. In 2004 there was \$10 million. I look at the four title numbers in 2006. In 2005 we received \$6.5 million and in 2006 it goes to \$7.3 million. Now I understand that there are some set asides but the District didn't tell you that they have applied to the federal Department of Education to use some of that set aside money for personnel. Now we won't know if they have been approved for that or not. So if that money comes back in that again is something that probably it was talked to us

about that they were going to have to use the set aside but they also didn't tell us about \$264,000 as of June 2, 2006 of the carry over. Those are all items, your Honor, when we start looking at budgets we only look at the \$143 million or the \$145.5 million that we give the School District. We never look at the other \$15 or \$16 million that they receive from the federal government. Those are things when you start looking at numbers...when 10% of a budget is outside the budget lines and now all of the sudden they are starting to put money aside because of what is going to happen with Bedford leaving in two years...that is not going to be enough money in two years to make up what they are trying to do. If we don't start talking about that today, the taxpayers in the City of Manchester are going to see a \$6 million hole. Two years from now we are going to be looking for 400 new teachers because they are going to be leaving and I have talked about this for five years and the School District has not come back with anything that says how do we fill those 400 positions. They are going to retire because they are going to want health insurance and that is the last time they can do it. So in two years, whoever is here, you may be looking at having to close the schools because they won't have enough bodies to open them in September. We have talked about that for five years and we got no reaction from the School District.

Mayor Guinta called for a vote on the motion to override the veto. Alderman Gatsas requested a roll call. Aldermen Gatsas, Pinard, Shea and Garrity voted nay. Aldermen Long, Duval, Osborne, O'Neil, Lopez, DeVries, Smith, Thibault, Forest and Roy voted yea. The motion carried.

Alderman Roy moved that the Appropriating Resolution ought to pass and be Enrolled as amended. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion. Mayor Guinta called for a vote. The motion carried with Aldermen Gatsas, Pinard, Shea and Garrity being duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman O'Neil moved that the Board go on record that special programs such as Ombudsman, STAY, PASS, TAP and full funding of athletics including freshman sports and lacrosse and that other extracurricular activities, whether it be music or the arts, that those should be funded. In my opinion, the budget that we passed fully funds those items and no teachers or district employees should be laid off. Alderman Duval duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Smith stated Alderman O'Neil there are no guarantees in life and we have a budget that is somewhat less than what the School Board wanted. I think it is putting the School Board in an awful position if you are going to ask them to fund every single item. They are going to have to make some type of adjustments to the budget and I wish you would adhere to that and not mandate...No Child Left Behind is mandated but it is not funded.

Alderman O'Neil responded what we pass is not binding. We have no authority. It is just what I believe the intent of this Board was.

Mayor Guinta called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Lopez stated I have one question. Alderman Gatsas said something very important. I know that they have a Committee working on West High School and all of that but what I would suggest is that we get some type of report on some of these major things that are coming up in the future so that we can have a better understanding of what is going on.

Mayor Guinta replied I agree. Let me talk to the Superintendent and see if he can get a report to the full Board.

Appropriating Resolution:

“A Resolution appropriating the sum of \$2,968,193 from Recreation User Charges to the Recreation Division for Fiscal Year 2007.”

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil it was voted to read the Resolution by title only, and it was so done.

Alderman Pinard moved that the Appropriating Resolution pass and be Enrolled. Alderman Long duly seconded the motion. Mayor Guinta called for a vote. Alderman Gatsas requested a roll call vote. Aldermen Gatsas, Long, Duval, Osborne, Pinard, O'Neil, Lopez, Shea, DeVries, Garrity, Smith, Thibault, Forest and Roy voted yea. The motion carried.

Appropriating Resolution:

“Amending a Resolution ‘Approving the Community Improvement Program for 2007, Raising and Appropriating Monies Therefore, and Authorizing Implementation of Said Program’.”

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard it was voted to read the Resolution by title only, and it was so done.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I would note that there was a handout for changes proposed to amend the 2007 CIP, which was submitted by CIP staff and it is amending Table 1 by replacing the Annual Bridge Maintenance #710907 with #711507 Annual Bridge Rehabilitation and the second change was adding to Table 1 #711907 Residential 50/50 Sidewalk Program for \$400,000 in other funds, which are the matching funds to the bond side.

Alderman Garrity moved that the Appropriating Resolution be amended as stated. Alderman Duval duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea asked could we raise objections to items on the CIP budget.

Mayor Guinta answered yes.

Alderman Shea stated I am opposed to the SEE Science Center getting \$15,000. I am also opposed to paying \$250,000 to the Hands Across the Merrimack and I am opposed to putting money into a fence at the Valley Cemetery.

Alderman DeVries stated I am hoping I can get some clarification on the amendments offered tonight. The 710907 replaced with 711507 and the Annual Bridge Rehab and the change within that.

Robert MacKenzie, Planning Director, stated that is a technical correction to make sure that the two bridge projects have separate numbers. They came through as the same number but there is a difference between the bridge maintenance and the bridge rehab.

Alderman DeVries asked on the second item, the 50/50 program, is that to allow other funds.

Mr. MacKenzie answered that is to reflect the contributions on the 50% side of the private contributions.

Alderman Gatsas stated I think it is and I don't know what Board members have been apprised of the lawsuit but obviously there is a \$10 million lawsuit and we are talking about bonding. Now I would think that it would be prudent that we as a Board sit down and understand whether that lawsuit is justifiable or not because I don't think that collectively we have enough money in the one time account to take care of the lawsuit. I look at this and say the taxpayers should we be found in court at fault and there is a \$10 million resolution then we have a problem. I don't see those funds coming up anywhere. I would think that we would start looking at what we are doing with bonding because there is that 900 lb. gorilla behind that curtain so if we all want to talk about being prudent with what we do, this would be a time and I don't know what the appropriate measure is with bonding resolutions and whether we have to do them tonight or whether those are situations that we can look at in a week so we can get apprised of where we are with the lawsuit that is coming before us. Now I understand that we can selectively pick things through here but I think I said everything I needed to say about the CIP budget last week or two weeks ago, whenever we met. I would think that the prudent person would understand where \$10 million is going to come from and how we are going to get there before we start voting on things that are wants and needs in a lawsuit. I don't know who is going to pay the bill but we all kind of just read about it in the paper and here we are in full Finance and there has not been a word said about it. I look at that and say that is not something that a businessman would duck. We are looking at a budget that is so-called bare bones but we have not talked about a \$10 million lawsuit. Not for one second. Not for one nickel and who is going to be responsible for it if it is wrong. I

look at that and say before we start running down a hasty road we better have answers to that or at least the direction we are going in and what legal counsel thinks our obligations might be. With that, your Honor, I would ask the City Solicitor whether a CIP budget can be put off until our July meeting or whether it has to go into effect July 1 or what the status of that is. I think we should get an idea of where we are or come back tomorrow night or recess and go into executive session to get some of those answers because we are not talking about a small number.

Mayor Guinta stated I certainly believe that the lawsuit that has been filed deserves some discussion. We have, as a Board, discussed it in the past. I am very confident about where the City is quite frankly relative to that suit but to get into the details of it we would probably have to go into non-public. Relative to the CIP, the proposal I put forward cuts bonding by 50%. I have to tell you I appreciate the Board recognizing the need for tightening the belt when it comes to bonding because quite frankly our debt level is at \$14 million a year on the City side and we need to get our hands around that. I think the Board has done a pretty good job when in previous years it has always been at \$20 million and we are at \$10 million. I think this Board has done a good job in trying to identify needs in the community. Not everyone is going to agree with every need that has been proposed but I certainly don't want people to miss the fact that funding has been cut by 50% as well as CIP cash which was cut by \$300,000 or \$400,000 and we are still, I think, providing for those who need the most and we are going to look at ways to set up a mechanism in the future to make sure that those dollars are being used as efficiently as possible. I would agree with you that we need to have a discussion as a Board regarding the suit but I do believe that it can be outside of the CIP process. I also believe that by law we are required to pass the CIP budget.

Alderman Gatsas stated somebody was asking for a request last week from Highway in regards to the ISTEA money and other funds and whether they could go to Granite Street or anything else. Alderman O'Neil I think you asked that didn't you? The allocation of the \$600,000 for Hands Across the Merrimack and whether that could go somewhere else so that we could complete the Granite Street Bridge because that is an additional \$4 million.

Alderman O'Neil replied I don't remember that I specifically asked for it. I remember there was a discussion and I thought the response was that it has to go for the project it was targeted for. Am I right on that Bob?

Mr. MacKenzie stated those two grants, the CDFA and the ISTEA TE funds cannot be used for normal roadway construction.

Alderman Gatsas asked unless the state so approves it.

Mr. MacKenzie answered the state cannot approve that. Those are federal regulations. TE, Transportation Enhancement, are designed specifically for things such as trails and non-roadway construction. So the state cannot override the federal ISTEA regulations.

Alderman Gatsas asked what about the other \$1.7 million that is in there.

Mr. MacKenzie answered there would only be a total of \$2.45 million of which \$1 million is City bond and that can be transferred by this Board.

Alderman Gatsas asked and the ISTEA money if it is not used by September we lose it.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I don't know if it is September but it is FY07.

Alderman Gatsas asked which ends in September.

Mr. MacKenzie answered it would be during the timeframe of our FY07.

Alderman Gatsas stated if it is federal dollars it is federal fiscal year.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the federal fiscal year does end in the middle of this fall, however, the indications we got were that it would be through the middle of next year that the funds would be available so the end of our FY07.

Alderman Gatsas replied I believe those funds were allocated two years ago. That is the 24-month money. Whatever.

Alderman O'Neil stated I said this in Finance and I just want to reiterate it. Having sat in Alderman Garrity's seat I want to commend him for reaching out to the Board and trying to include not only the Mayor but the 14 Aldermen. That is appreciated.

Alderman Smith stated I would like to ask Kevin Clougherty have we received the settlement from Verizon that is over \$600,000 that we could utilize towards the bonding.

Mr. Clougherty responded we haven't gotten the check yet Alderman.

Alderman Smith asked but we are anticipating it coming in shortly right.

Mr. Clougherty answered yes.

Mayor Guinta called for a vote on the motion that the Appropriating Resolution be amended as stated. The motion carried with Alderman Gatsas being duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman Roy moved that the Appropriating Resolution pass and be Enrolled as amended. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion. Mayor Guinta called for a vote. Alderman Gatsas requested a roll call. Aldermen Gatsas, Pinard, and DeVries voted nay. Aldermen Long, Duval, Osborne, O'Neil, Lopez, Shea, Garrity, Smith, Thibault, Forest and Roy voted yea. The motion carried.

Bond Resolutions:

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Three Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$300,000) for the 2007 CIP 411907, Police/Fire CAD/RMS Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Million Nine Hundred Seventy Five Thousand Dollars (\$1,975,000) for the 2007 CIP 510907, Parks Improvement Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Three Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$300,000) for the 2007 CIP 511007, School Recreation Facility Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$200,000) for the 2007 CIP 612407, Neighborhood Revitalization Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Three Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$300,000) for the 2007 CIP 711507, Annual Bridge Rehabilitation Program.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Million Seven Hundred Twenty Five Thousand Dollars (\$1,725,000) for the 2007 CIP 711607, Annual ROW Reconstruction Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000) for the 2007 CIP 711807, PW/Fleet Maintenance Administrative Support Facility Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Four Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$400,000) for the 2007 CIP 711907, Residential 50/50 Sidewalk/Curb Program.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$500,000) for the 2007 CIP 712007, Storm Drain Infrastructure Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$800,000) for the 2007 CIP 712107, Municipal Facility Improvements Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$250,000) for the 2007 CIP 712207, Hands Across The Merrimack Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Million Two Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$1,250,000) for the 2007 CIP 712307, Cohas Phase 2 – Contract 1 Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Three Million Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$3,200,000) for the 2007 CIP 712607, WWTF – Replace Secondary Clarifier Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Six Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$650,000) for the 2007 CIP 712707, WWTF Facility Plan – Phase 2 Project.”

Alderman O'Neil moved to dispense with the reading by titles only. Alderman Long duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Roy stated just because this is one of the last nights, we did waive readings last week to expedite the time but as we are about to pass this and people do watch this at home I would say that we should read by titles only and have it on the record for the public at home.

Alderman Gatsas asked does somebody know where the \$500,000 for storm drain infrastructures is and are they going to know that if somebody reads it.

Mayor Guinta called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Roy being duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman Garrity moved that the Bond Resolutions pass and be Enrolled. Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea stated I just wanted to note that I am opposed to the \$250,000 Resolution for Hands Across the Merrimack.

Mayor Guinta called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman Gatsas being duly recorded in opposition.

Resolutions:

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to Make Certain Budgetary Closings for the Year 2006.”

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$20,000) from Contingency to Fire – Line.”

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000) from Contingency to Fire – Mechanical Division.”

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of Forty Three Thousand Dollars (\$43,000) from Contingency to Police – Uniformed Police.”

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault it was voted to dispense with the reading by titles only.

Alderman Roy moved that the Resolutions pass and be Enrolled. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion. Mayor Guinta called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have two things and I don't know what the Board's wishes are. The Committee on Administration met tonight to try to do that transition with the parking enterprise and the traffic division. If we don't take it up tonight, we take it up on July 11 I think. I don't know what that hurts. We would need unanimous consent to bring it in.

Mayor Guinta responded I would accept that.

Alderman O'Neil stated secondly before we run away I want to thank the City staff and the departments for all of their patience during this whole process. You know what is great about tonight is as many times as we met and got a little heated there were some laughs tonight, which was pretty good. I just wanted to say that.

Alderman Duval stated while we are giving out kudos, I think Alderman Gatsas did a commendable job. Despite the fact I heard from Veteran Aldermen around the Board that there were a great number of meeting, I think he is to be commended for his stewardship through the budget process and I think also Chairman of the Board, Mike Lopez. I know we have talked a number of times and he expressed a willingness to cooperate and be flexible and accommodating and everything else and I know it took a lot of his personal time so thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Roy it was unanimously voted to allow an item of new business.

A report of the Committee on Administration/Information Systems was presented recommending that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen accept the transition plans of the Traffic Division and Parking Division as submitted and further recommends that the Board immediate adopt Ordinance:

“Amending Chapter 70 Motor Vehicles and Traffic of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by adding §70.44 Division of Parking Management and Operations; adding §70.45 Duties of the Division of Parking Management and Operations and by Amending § 70.46, §70.47 and §70.48.”

under suspension of the rules.

Alderman O'Neil stated the two transition plans were prepared by Mr. Borek and Mr. Sheppard if there are any specific questions and then there are the ordinances that have to be adopted.

Alderman Gatsas asked can I have a minute to read this please.

Alderman O'Neil moved to accept the report. Alderman DeVries duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Gatsas stated I am looking on Page 3 of the report and it talks about the MEDO Director will oversee the management contract for the Victory Garage. Now I would hope

that by now we have set-up a Traffic Department that oversees parking in the City that at some point we will stop paying a contractor that is at risk for the City continually.

Alderman O'Neil replied if you read a couple of paragraphs down Mr. Borek's recommendation is just for six months. That will hopefully be it. It gives time for the Parking Manager to come on board and assume the responsibility.

Alderman Gatsas responded Alderman O'Neil I am going to ask you as the Chairman of that Committee that at the end of six months we terminate that contract. If it doesn't happen because we don't hire somebody...it has been a four year and six month extension and the City is continually paying. We were in St. Mary's original building on the West Side in a snowstorm...

Alderman O'Neil interjected you don't forget that do you.

Alderman Gatsas replied no I don't because when I look at something that says it is costing us money for no reason I would think that at some point the six months would stop and the City would take over. Now I would hope that at the end of six months we could tell the people that are managing that garage that we no longer need their services.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think if you read Mr. Borek's recommendation it is "to allow the Parking Manager to take charge and determine whether to bring the Victory Garage operations in-house or rebid." I think in some of the discussions I have had with Mr. Borek he is very interested in looking at bringing it in-house. There will be some savings to it. I don't want to speak for him. He is here.

Alderman Gatsas responded Mr. Borek hasn't been here for five years because if he was here for five years he would have heard that same discussion.

Mayor Guinta stated I can certainly appreciate the frustration on this issue because as an Alderman I shared this frustration. What I am hearing from the Chair of the Committee is that he is going to be looking for a recommendation once this individual is on Board. I think every option is on the table at this moment and I think we all agree that we have to do something about that garage.

Alderman O'Neil stated now that we have moved in that direction, Alderman, I am fully behind you on that one.

Alderman Lopez stated I think Mr. Borek is here and he knows it is the number one priority to take care of that the minute that guy comes on board. He can even start working on it now himself and find out the details from Denise and get the data ready.

Alderman DeVries asked do you need a motion to send this to Bills on Second Reading.

Mayor Guinta answered there is a motion on the floor now. We have to accept the report and then it would require an ordinance.

Mayor Guinta called for a vote on the motion to accept, receive and adopt the report of the Committee on Administration/Information Systems. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated it is my understanding that the Committee wished to have the ordinance adopted this evening. So we would look for a motion to suspend the rules and place the ordinance on its final reading at this time without referral to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading or Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue Administration.

Alderman Forest moved to suspend the rules and place the ordinance on its final reading at this time without referral to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading or Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue Administration. Alderman DeVries duly seconded the motion. Mayor Guinta called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

On motion of Alderman Pinard, duly seconded by Alderman Roy it was voted to read the Ordinance by title only, and it was so done.

“Amending Chapter 70 Motor Vehicles and Traffic of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by adding §70.44 Division of Parking Management and Operations; adding §70.45 Duties of the Division of Parking Management and Operations and by Amending § 70.46, §70.47 and §70.48.”

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to Ordain.

This being a special meeting, no further business was presented and on motion of Alderman Pinard, duly seconded by Alderman Smith it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk